

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

CONFIRMATION NO. ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR P-1145-US4 10/534,084 05/06/2005 Yoav Paltieli 2380 **EXAMINER** 49443 7590 01/10/2006 PEARL COHEN ZEDEK, LLP WINAKUR, ERIC FRANK 10 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER **SUITE 1001** NEW YORK, NY 10020 3735

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		€	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/534,084	PALTIELI, YOAV	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eric F. Winakur	3735	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTED TO THE	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Thi)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☒ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1,2,4,8,10,11,14,15,17,20,21,23,25,26,28,30,31,34,36 and 37 is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) <u>1,2,4,8,10,11,14,15,17,20,21,23,25,26,28,30,31,34,36 and 37</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 May 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat pority documents have been receive	ion No	
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			
	to the continue copies have con-		
•			
Attachment(s)		•	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary		
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/6/05</u>. 	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 37 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "for of". (line 6) should read "for". Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

2. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 34, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 34, 36, and 37 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,669,653. This is a double patenting rejection.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant cites several references that teach a variety of measurement systems and methods for monitoring the progress of labor. In particular, Cannon et al. teach a cervical dilation measuring device that measures a current induced in a coil when a current is passed through a second coil. The measured current is correlated with the distance between the two coils. Acker et al. teach an

obstetrical instrument system and method that determines position information related to maternal and fetal positions that relies upon measurement of non-ionizing fields, such as magnetic fields. Portions of the system are positioned on the mother and fetus, but the method does not include touching a position sensor to a fetal presenting part and a set of points on the mother or an apparatus for performing such a method, as set forth in the claims. Kemper et al. teach an ultrasound-based measurement system for determining cervical effacement and dilation. Ishikawa et al. teach a position measurement system, which can be used in performing measurements related to labor. None of the prior art teaches or suggests a method for monitoring the progress of labor that includes touching a position sensor to a fetal presenting part and a set of points on the mother and monitoring the position of the fetal presenting part with respect to at least one point from the set of points on the mother or calculating a relationship based on the sensed data, as set forth in the claims. Further, the prior art does not teach or suggest a position monitoring apparatus that includes a fetal key, a position sensor including a portion matching the shape of the fetal key, and a monitor for sensing the position of the position sensor.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric F. Winakur whose telephone number is 571/272-4736. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-5; alternate Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ali Imam can be reached on 571/272-4737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Éric F Winakur Primary Examiner Art Unit 3735

6 January 2006